Reply to Office Action of November 12, 2008

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS:

Minor changes are made to this specification. Support for the amendment to the specification can be found at p. 16, line 18-p. 18, line 1 of Applicant's specification. Claims 3 and 7 are amended. Claims 1-10 are pending in the application. Reexamination and reconsideration of the application, as amended, are respectfully requested.

DRAWINGS:

The Office states, "Figure 3C should be designated by a legend such as --Prior Art-- because only that which is old is illustrated." In response, Applicant clarified the specification by indicating that Figure 3C is a timing chart of a case where a suspend time is not set. Support for the amendment to the specification can be found at p. 16, line 18-p. 18, line 1 of Applicant's specification. Withdrawal of this objection is thus respectfully requested.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102:

Claims 3 and 4 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated Applicant's Admitted Prior Art (hereinafter "AAPA"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. Claim 3, as amended, is as follows:

A wireless communication terminal, which performs wireless communication using each of a first communication protocol and a second communication protocol and enables to be in an idle state with both protocols, comprising:

a setting section that sets a suspend time for detecting an incoming call from a base station using the first communication protocol subsequent to completion of communication with the base station using the first communication protocol;

Attorney Docket No. 81887.0124 Customer No. 26021

Appl. No. 10/538,165

Amdt. Dated May 12, 2009

Reply to Office Action of November 12, 2008

a first changing section that changes a monitoring timing of the second communication protocol: and

a second changing section that changes a monitoring timing of the first communication protocol by communicating with the base station when the first changing section changes the monitoring timing of the second communication protocol,

wherein the setting section does not set the suspend time after the second changing section changes the monitoring timing of the first communication method by communicating with the base station.

Applicant respectfully submits that AAPA cannot anticipate or render claim 3 obvious, because AAPA fails to teach or suggest that "the setting section does not set the suspend time after the second changing section changes the monitoring timing of the first communication method by communicating with the base station."

As discussed above and clarified by the amendment to the specification, Figure 3C is NOT Prior Art, since Figure 3C represents a timing chart of a case where a suspend time is not set. Therefore, the case in which a suspend time is not set is not Prior Art. (Applicant's specification, at p. 16, line 18-p. 18, line 1).

In light of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that AAPA cannot anticipate or render claim 3 obvious, because AAPA fails to teach or suggest each and every claim limitation. Claim 4 depends from claim 3 and cannot be anticipated or rendered obvious for at least the same reasons as claim 3. Withdrawal of this rejection is thus respectfully requested.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C § 103:

Claims 3, 4, 7, and 8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over AAPA in view of Turner (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0152049). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Attorney Docket No. 81887.0124 Customer No. 26021

Amdt. Dated May 12, 2009 Reply to Office Action of November 12, 2008

Appl. No. 10/538,165

Claims 3 and 4 are patentable over AAPA for reasons discussed above. The Office cites Turner for disclosing.

"a wireless communication terminal (Fig. 2; Abstract; note the hybrid access terminal), which performs wireless communication using each of a first communication method and a second communication method (Abstract) and enables to be in an idle state with both methods (paragraphs [0057]-[0064]), comprising: a setting section that sets a suspend time (Fig. 2, reference 214) wherein the setting section does not set the suspend time in a case of communicating with the base station by the second changing section (paragraphs [0098]-[0101]; note that while the terminal is communicating with the base station (i.e., when data packets are being exchanged) dormancy is not detected and the dormancy timer (i.e., the suspend timer) is not set)." (Office Action, at p. 8, line 14-p. 9, line 2.

In response, Applicant respectfully submits that Turner fails to teach or suggest the limitation "wherein the setting section does not set the suspend time after the second changing section changes the monitoring timing of the first communication method by communicating with the base station" (emphasis added), as clarified by amended claim 3.

According to the present invention, the suspend time is not set after the monitoring time is changed. Therefore, it is possible to prevent the incoming call arrival rate from becoming slower due to the change of the monitoring timing.

In light of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that AAPA and Turner cannot render claims 3 and 4 obvious, because the combination of AAPA and Turner fails to teach or suggest each and every claim limitation. Claims 7 and 8 require the similar limitation of "not setting a suspend time for detecting an incoming call from the base station using the first communication protocol after the monitoring time of the first communication method is changed by communicating with the base station," and are therefore, patentable over AAPA and Turner for reasons discussed above. Withdrawal of this rejection is thus respectfully requested.

Appl. No. 10/538,165 Amdt. Dated May 12, 2009 Reply to Office Action of November 12, 2008 Attorney Docket No. 81887.0124 Customer No. 26021

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Reexamination and reconsideration of the application, as amended, are requested.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at the Los Angeles, California telephone number (310) 785-4600 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance.

If there are any fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-1314.

Respectfully submitted,

HOGAN & HARTSON L.L.P.

Registration No. 50,220

Date: May 12, 2009

1999 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 1400

Los Angeles, California 90067 Phone: (310) 785-4600

Fax:

(310) 785-4601